

File No. 230430

Committee Item No. _____

Board Item No. 41

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: _____

Date: _____

Board of Supervisors Meeting

Date: April 18, 2023

Cmte Board

- Motion
- Resolution
- Ordinance
- Legislative Digest
- Budget and Legislative Analyst Report
- Youth Commission Report
- Introduction Form
- Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report
- MOU
- Grant Information Form
- Grant Budget
- Subcontract Budget
- Contract/Agreement
- Form 126 – Ethics Commission
- Award Letter
- Application
- Public Correspondence

OTHER

- Nomination Letter - 4/12/23 _____
- Application Form _____
- Resume _____
- Information Sheet _____
- 2019 Gender Analysis of Commissions and Boards _____
- _____
- _____
- _____

Prepared by: Lisa Lew

Date: April 14, 2023

Prepared by: _____

Date: _____

1 [Appointment, Child Care Planning and Advisory Council - Benson Wong]

2

3 **Motion appointing Benson Wong, term ending March 19, 2025, to the Child Care**
4 **Planning and Advisory Council.**

5

6 MOVED, That the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco does
7 hereby appoint the hereinafter designated person to serve as a member of the Child Care
8 Planning and Advisory Council, pursuant to the provisions of the Administrative Code, Article
9 XX, Section 5.200, and Section 10.100-367, and California Education Code, Sections 8499.3-
10 8499.7, for the terms specified:

11 Benson Wong, seat 6, succeeding Beverly Melugin, term expired, must be a nominee
12 of the District 6 Supervisor and represent one of the following categories: consumers, child
13 care providers, discretionary, community representatives, or public agency representatives,
14 for the unexpired portion of a three-year term ending March 19, 2025.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

City and County
of San Francisco



Board of Supervisors,
District 6

MATT DORSEY

麥德誠

TO: Rules Committee Clerk
FROM: Madison Tam, Legislative Aide to Supervisor Matt Dorsey
DATE: April 12, 2023
SUBJECT: Appointment by Supervisor Matt Dorsey

Please be advised that Supervisor Matt Dorsey has selected Benson Wong to be appointed to the Childcare Planning and

This appointment will fill seat 6.

For Clerk's office use only:

Seat #: _____ Term expiration date: _____ Seat Vacated: _____

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184
Fax No. (415) 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

Application for Boards / Commissions / Committees / Task Forces INSTRUCTIONS AND APPLICATION

San Francisco is a diverse City and County with a wide range of people and issues affecting it. In order to take advantage of the extensive experience and knowledge available throughout our communities, various Boards/Commissions/Committees/Task Forces have been established to bring that knowledge together. These groups and their membership requirements are established by legislation approved through the local, state, and/or federal government.

In addition to setting up the purpose and goals of the various groups, the governing legislation outlines the type of person - in terms of desirable skills and/or knowledge - who can contribute their knowledge and perspective. In this manner, a group of San Franciscans, who are representative of the City and County, can be active participants in addressing issues affecting the entire City and County.

If you are interested in serving the City and County of San Francisco, the following procedures are provided:

1. A list of vacancies and expected vacancies, with their qualifications, can be found at the Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, at the San Francisco Main Public Library, and online on the Board of Supervisors' website (<http://www.sfbos.org/vacancy>). Please review this list for positions of interest.
2. Submit an application (http://www.sfbos.org/vacancy_application)
(List all of the appropriate seat number(s) and/or category/categories for which you qualify. We request applications be received ten (10) days before the scheduled hearing.)

Applicants may also need to submit a Form 700, Statement of Economic Interests (<https://www.fppc.ca.gov/Form700.html>), along with their application for all bodies listed in [Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code, Section 3.1-103\(a\)\(1\)](#).

3. If the seat(s) you are applying for is vacant and requires the Board of Supervisors' confirmation, the Rules Committee may schedule your application for review. Applicants should expect to appear before the Rules Committee to speak on their qualifications and answer questions during a public hearing.
(There are no set instructions on what you are expected to present to the Rules Committee; however, a brief description of how your qualifications distinguish you from other applicants, reasons for your interest in the subject, and/or a short summarization on why you would make a good candidate is appropriate.)
4. The Rules Committee may or may not make a recommendation for appointment. If a recommendation is made by the Rules Committee, the recommendation is forwarded to the Board of Supervisors for approval. It generally takes approximately 15 days from the date the Rules Committee makes their recommendation, for the individual to become officially appointed.
5. Depending on the type of organization, a new appointee may need to take an Oath of Office.

If there are no vacancies, your application will be retained for one year. If any openings occur during this time, your application will be submitted to the Rules Committee for review.

If you have any further questions, please contact the Rules Committee Clerk at (415) 554-5184. If you require detailed information concerning the operations of a particular Board/Commission/Committee/Task Force, please contact the administering department directly.

(Applications must be submitted to BOS-Appointments@sfgov.org or to the mailing address listed above.)

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184
Fax No. (415) 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

Application for Boards, Commissions, Committees, & Task Forces

Name of Board/Commission/Committee/Task Force: Childcare Planning & Advisory Council (CPAC)

Seat # (Required - see Vacancy Notice for qualifications): #6

Full Name: Ben Wong

[Redacted] Francisco CA 94118 Zip Code: 94118

[Redacted] Occupation: Executive Director

Work Phone: 415.665.4212 Employer: Wah Mei School

Business Address: 1400 Judah Street San Francisco CA Zip Code: 94122

Business Email: bwong@wahmei.org Home Email: [Redacted]

Pursuant to Charter, Section 4.101(a)(2), Boards and Commissions established by the Charter must consist of residents of the City and County of San Francisco who are 18 years of age or older (unless otherwise stated in the code authority). For certain appointments, the Board of Supervisors may waive the residency requirement.

Resident of San Francisco: Yes [X] No [] If No, place of residence:
18 Years of Age or Older: Yes [X] No []

Pursuant to Mayoral Order, members of boards/commissions are required to be Covid-19 vaccinated and attend in-person meetings.

Covid-19 Vaccinated: Yes [X] No []

Pursuant to Charter, Section 4.101(a)(1), please state how your qualifications represent the communities of interest, neighborhoods, and the diversity in ethnicity, race, age, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, types of disabilities, and any other relevant demographic qualities of the City and County of San Francisco:

American born Chinese San Francisco native and current resident. I have been in the non-profit work space for over 30+ years, at least 15 years in early care and education. I grew up in Chinatown / Northbeach, a product of San Francisco Unified School District and San Francisco State University, where i have obtained a Bachelors Degree in Information Sytems and a Masters in Marriage and Family Therapy (MFT). I have community work experience throughtout San Francisco, including the Tenderloin, SOMA, Civic Center, and Financial District.

Business and/or Professional Experience:

Thirty years of non-profit community work, particularly specializing in Child and Youth Development. Previous Community Organizer with San Francisco SAFE and youth health educator with Asian & Pacific Islander Wellness Center, where I conducted support groups for API youth in Juvenile Hall. Former Director of the Chinatown Beacon Center, interim Executive Director of Wu Yee Children's Services, and GSA Network.

Currently, I am the Executive Director of Wah Mei School, a community based dual language non-profit. Started in 1974, for almost 50 years, Wah Mei has specialized in child development programs serving the Chinese American community. Wah Mei has grown to three divisions: Early Care & Education (ECE); Extended Learning for School-Aged; and Community Engagement. Our ECE division serves 0-5 year olds at three (3) sites, including two sites in District #6 (SOMA, Financial District) -- specifically at 90 - 7th Street and 75 Hawthorne.

Civic Activities:

I am a current member of the San Francisco Planning Department's Equity Advisory Council (2020). <https://sfplanning.org/project/san-francisco-community-equity-advisory-council#about>

Since 2019, a member of the Board of Director member for Parents for Public Schools, where I currently serve as Vice-President

Previous appointment by the San Francisco Superior Court to the Juvenile Justice Commission (2006 - 2014).

Previous member of Advisory Council, Peer Resources (2011 - 2014)


Previously appointed by the Board of Supervisors and served as President of (the now defunct) San Francisco Delinquency Prevention Commission

Have you attended any meetings of the body to which you are applying? Yes No

An appearance before the Rules Committee may be required at a scheduled public hearing, prior to the Board of Supervisors considering the recommended appointment. Applications should be received ten (10) days prior to the scheduled public hearing.

Date: 10/31/2022

Applicant's Signature (required):



*(Manually sign or type your complete name.
NOTE: By typing your complete name, you are hereby consenting to use of electronic signature.)*

Please Note: Your application will be retained for one year. Once completed, this form, including all attachments, become public record.

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Appointed to Seat #: _____ Term Expires: _____ Date Vacated: _____

EXPERIENCE*Executive Management, Administration & Operations*

Over 30+ year's experience in executive management and supervision of staff in executive, administrative, and multiple program arenas. Possess extensive experience in effective problem-solving in dynamic complex systems. Expertise in administrative functions including staffing, scheduling, planning and operations for various size organizations up to 110 employees. Interface with all aspects of agency operations including fund development, program delivery, fiscal oversight, human resources, board and staff relations, and information technology. Oversee, manage, and monitor local, state and federal contracts, and foundation grants. Create and monitor agency budgets. Interface with the Board of Directors of various non-profit entities. Lead, facilitate, and participate in numerous strategic planning processes.

Organizational, Community & Policy Development

Founded a consulting business focused on strategic development, operations, board recruitment/development, project management, and community development. Create and maintain continuous involvement in the sustainability of community collaborations, school/community partnerships, and youth development and OST service providers. Provide policy advice and advocacy to San Francisco's Board of Supervisors on adolescent, delinquency prevention, and juvenile justice issues. Monitor Juvenile Justice Detention facility for (non)compliance of State regulations via the Delinquency Prevention Commission and the Juvenile Justice Commission. Organize neighborhood watch groups and community networks to address safety and crime prevention concerns. Initiate, recruit staff and participants, and co-created a City-wide Out-of-School Time collaborative to strengthen communication, promote after school efforts, and advocate for additional services. Provide expertise and guidance on child care initiatives, youth development principles, education and academic performance, community partnerships, college preparation, youth leadership and empowerment programs.

Facilitation, Counseling & Case Management

Facilitate community and staff dialogs to discuss public concerns, education, and social change. Assist youth involved in the juvenile justice system and at-risk/high-risk youth in program services including school enrollment, court appointment, juvenile probation, tutoring, health education, home visits, and counseling. Plan, schedule, create curriculum, and facilitate workshops in the areas of youth employment, healthy teen relationships, leadership competencies, and social justice matters. Train staff and provide technical assistance in facilitation, staff supervision, peer counseling, budgeting, and program planning and development.

AFFILIATIONS & HONORS

- Vice-President and Member. Parents for Public School, San Francisco. 2019-Present
- Member, Advisory Committee, Peer Resources, Community Initiatives. 2011 – 2014
- Chair and Member, Juvenile Justice Commission. 2006 - 2014
- Member, Board of Directors, Development & Special Events Committee, Wu Yee Children's Services. 2005 – 2011
- Distinguished Achievement Award for Academic Excellence, College of Health & Human Services, SFSU
- Graduate Student Award for Distinguished Achievement. Department of Counseling, SFSU

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

2016 – Present	Executive Director	Wah Mei School
2009 – Present	Founder & Principal	Community Collaborative Consulting
2014 – 2015	Executive Director (Interim)	Gay-Straight Alliance Network
2011– 2012	Executive Director (Interim)	Wu Yee Children's Services
2010 – 2011	Director of Programs	Chinese Culture Center of San Francisco
2005 – 2009	Deputy Director & Director, CBC	Community Educational Services
2001 – 2005	Director	Chinatown Beacon Center
1997 – 2001	Associate Director, HIV Testing & Training	Asian & Pacific Islander Wellness

EDUCATION

M.S., Counseling, Marriage & Family Therapy
 B.S., Business Information & Computing Systems

San Francisco State University
 San Francisco State University



CHILD CARE PLANNING AND ADVISORY COUNCIL

The below listed summary of seats, term expirations and membership information shall serve as notice of **vacancies, upcoming term expirations** and information on currently held seats, appointed by the Board of Supervisors. Appointments by other bodies are listed, if available. Seat numbers listed in **bold** are open for immediate appointment. However, you are able to submit applications for all seats and your application will be maintained for one year, in the event that an unexpected vacancy or opening occurs.

Membership and Seat Qualifications

Seat #	Appointing Authority	Seat Holder	Term Ending	Qualification
1	BOS	Savitha Moorthy	9/14/23	Must be a nominee of the District 1 Supervisor and represent one of the following categories: consumers, child care providers, discretionary, community representatives, or public agency representatives, for a three-year term
2	BOS	Patricia Sullivan (second term)	3/19/25	Must be a nominee of the District 2 Supervisor and represent one of the following categories: consumers, child care providers, discretionary, community representatives, or public agency representatives, for a three-year term
3	BOS	Jerry Yang <i>(first term)</i> (residency waived)	3/19/24	Must be a nominee of the District 3 Supervisor and represent one of the following categories: consumers, child care providers, discretionary, community representatives, or public agency representatives, for a three-year term
4	BOS	Ivy Ng (first term)	3/19/24	Must be a nominee of the District 4 Supervisor and represent one of the following categories: consumers, child care providers, discretionary, community representatives, or public agency

				representatives, for a three-year term
5	BOS	Elizabeth Winograd <i>(first term)</i>	3/19/24	Must be a nominee of the District 5 Supervisor and represent one of the following categories: consumers, child care providers, discretionary, community representatives, or public agency representatives, for a three-year term
6	BOS	Beverly Melugin <i>(second term)</i>	3/19/22	Must be a nominee of the District 6 Supervisor and represent one of the following categories: consumers, child care providers, discretionary, community representatives, or public agency representatives, for a three-year term
7	BOS	Mona Malan <i>(first term)</i>	9/14/20	Must be a nominee of the District 7 Supervisor and represent one of the following categories: consumers, child care providers, discretionary, community representatives, or public agency representatives, for a three-year term
8	BOS	Heather Cassandra Morado (residency requirement waived) <i>(first term)</i>	3/19/23	Must be a nominee of the District 8 Supervisor and represent one of the following categories: consumers, child care providers, discretionary, community representatives, or public agency representatives, for a three-year term ending
9	BOS	Yensing Sihapanya <i>(first term)</i>	3/19/23	Must be a nominee of the District 9 Supervisor and represent one of the following categories: consumers, child care providers, discretionary, community representatives, or public agency representatives, for a three-year term

10	BOS	Jonathan Skolnick (first term)	3/19/25	Must be a nominee of the District 10 Supervisor and represent one of the following categories: consumers, child care providers, discretionary, community representatives, or public agency representatives, for a three-year term
11	BOS	Monique Guidry (first term)	9/14/23	Must be a nominee of the District 11 Supervisor and represent one of the following categories: consumers, child care providers, discretionary, community representatives, or public agency representatives, for a three-year term
12	BOS	Jessica Campos (first term)	3/19/24	Must be a nominee of the President of the Board of Supervisors and represent one of the following categories: consumers, child care providers, discretionary, community representatives, or public agency representatives, for a three-year term
13	BOS/SFUSD	Sherrice Dorsey-Smith (Residency Requirement Waived)(First Term)	3/19/25	Must be jointly appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the Board of Education, or the County Superintendent of Schools, if the Board of Education delegates the appointment power to her/him, for a three-year term
	SFUSD			Twelve (12) members appointed by the Board of Education

Half of the Advisory Council members are appointed by the Board of Supervisors and half are appointed by the San Francisco Board of Education.

Applicants interested in a seat on the Advisory Council, including those appointed by the Board of Education, may contact Tony Tyson, CPAC Coordinator, at anthony.tyson@sfgov.org for current information on seat qualifications and vacancies.

The following seat qualification categories are available:

- **Three (3) "Consumer"**
- **Three (2) "Child Care Provider"**
- **One (1) "Community Representative"**
- **One (1) "Public Agency Representative"**

Seat Qualification Definitions: Pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 5.200(e), and California Education Code, Section 8499.3, the membership of the Child Care Planning and Advisory Council requires a percentage balance of the overall membership consisting of members from each of the following categories:

1. The list of qualified individuals for nomination and appointment may include members of the following: parents, guardians, or caretakers with varied income levels who use child care and/or early education services, including but not limited to clients of publicly subsidized programs, such as CalWORKS, and other child care programs funded through the San Francisco Human Services Agency, California Department of Education, Head Start, or Preschool for All (20% or five members).

Child Care Providers: The list of qualified individuals for nomination and appointment must include a representative from Head Start, and may include members of the following: private and subsidized child care providers, including but not limited to private centers and family day care homes, a Title 5 program, a school age program, Head Start, or Preschool for All (20% or five members).

2. The list of qualified individuals for nomination and appointment must include a representative from one of the County's resource and referral agencies and may include members of the following: the public at large and/or any of the other categories, or outside of these categories at the discretion of the appointing agencies (20% or five members).

Community Representatives: The list of qualified individuals for nomination and appointment may include members of the following: parent advisory councils of public and private child care programs; associations of child care providers, family child care providers, and Head Start; City College of San Francisco, San Francisco State University, or public interest organizations, including but not limited to the Child Care Law Center, Low Income Investment Fund community organizations, members of labor organizations, and local businesses that fall within the definition of "community representative," as described in San Francisco Administrative Code, Section (e)(1)(B); and other community and public agency representatives that deal with child care (20% or five members).

3. **Public Agency Representatives:** The list of qualified individuals for nomination and appointment must include representatives from two of the following agencies: Department of Children, Youth, and Their Families, Human Services Agency, San

Francisco Children and Families Commission, Community Care Licensing, Department of Public Health, Recreation and Park Department, Mayor's Office of Community Investment, San Francisco Housing Authority, or other entities (20% or five members).

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS (BOS) APPLICATION FORMS AVAILABLE HERE

- English - https://sfbos.org/sites/default/files/vacancy_application.pdf
- 中文 - https://sfbos.org/sites/default/files/vacancy_application_CHI.pdf
- Español - https://sfbos.org/sites/default/files/vacancy_application_SPA.pdf
- Filipino - https://sfbos.org/sites/default/files/vacancy_application_FIL.pdf

(For seats appointed by other Authorities please contact the Board / Commission / Committee / Task Force (see below) or the appointing authority directly.)

Please Note: Depending upon the posting date, a vacancy may have already been filled. To determine if a vacancy for this Commission is still available, or if you require additional information, please call the Rules Committee Clerk at (415) 554-5184.

Applications and other documents may be submitted to BOS-Appointments@sfgov.org

Next Steps: Applicants who meet minimum qualifications will be contacted by the Rules Committee Clerk once the Rules Committee Chair determines the date of the hearing. Members of the Rules Committee will consider the appointment(s) at the meeting and applicant(s) may be asked to state their qualifications. The appointment of the individual(s) who is recommended by the Rules Committee will be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors for final approval.

The Child Care Planning and Advisory Council consists of twenty-five (25) members. The Board of Supervisors appoints twelve (12) members: one (1) nominated by each individual member of the Board, and approved by the full Board; and one (1) nominated by the President of the Board. The Board of Education or County Superintendent of Schools, if the Board of Education delegates the appointment power to him/her, shall also appoint twelve (12) members. One (1) member shall be jointly appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the Board of Education, or the County Superintendent of Schools, if the Board of Education delegates the appointment power to him/her.

The members appointed by the Board of Supervisors shall be representative of the following categories:

- A) "Consumers" - Parents, guardians or caretakers with varied income levels who use child care and/or early education services, including but not limited to clients of publicly subsidized programs such as CalWORKS, and other child care programs funded through the San Francisco Human Services Agency, the California Department of Education, Head Start or Preschool for All;

- B) "Child Care Providers" - Private and subsidized child care providers including, but not limited to, from a private center, from a family day care home, a Title 5 program, a school age program, from a Head Start center and from a Preschool for All site;
- C) "Discretionary" - Representatives of the public at-large and/or representatives from any of the other categories, or outside of these categories at the discretion of the appointing agencies;
- D) "Community Representatives" - Parent advisory councils of public and private child care programs; associations of child care providers, family child care providers and Head Start; City College of San Francisco, San Francisco State University, public interest organizations including, but not limited to, the Child Care Law Center, Low Income Investment Fund community organizations, members of labor organizations and local businesses that fall within the definition of "community representative" as described in Subsection (d)(1) (B) and other community and public agency representatives that deal with child care; and
- E) "Public Agency Representatives" - Representative from two of the following agencies: the Department of Children, Youth and Their Families, Human Services Agency, San Francisco Children and Families Commission, Community Care Licensing, Department of Public Health, Recreation and Park Department, Mayor's Office of Community Investment and San Francisco Housing Authority, or other entities.

The Council is established to advise the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, the San Francisco Children and Families Commission and, with their consent, the Board of Education and the Superintendent of Schools about child care issues. The Council will serve as a representative advisory and planning body to maintain, expand and improve local child care services. The Council will provide links between government and the community, and will work to maximize the amount and impact of local state, federal and private resources and funding for child care in San Francisco. Powers and Duties are outlined in Administrative Code, Section 5.200.

All terms shall be for three years. Members may serve for up to two consecutive terms, and may be re-appointed after one year off the Council. No terms served prior to March 8, 2010, shall be counted towards the term limit for Council members. A member appointed to serve a term of two years or less, including the initial term provided in the preceding paragraph, shall not be deemed to have served a full term for purposes of this term limit.

Reports: None referenced.

Compensation: Upon approval by the Council, each member who is not otherwise compensated to attend meetings may receive a stipend of no more than \$50 per meeting, not to exceed \$600 annually, exclusively from funds provided to the Council by the State of California.

Authority: Administrative Code, Article XX, Section 5.200; Administrative Code, Section 10.100-367; and California Education Code, Section 8499.3-8499.7 (Ordinance Nos. 362-95, 118-99, 192-99, 31-00, 6-03, and 49-10)

Sunset Date: None

Contact: Licette Montejano
Office of Early Care and Education
1650 Mission Street, Suite 312
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 355-3671
licette.montejano@sfgov.org

Updated: November 23, 2022

GENDER ANALYSIS OF COMMISSIONS AND BOARDS



City and County of San Francisco
London N. Breed
Mayor

Department on the Status of Women
Emily M. Murase, PhD
Director



Acknowledgements

The data collection and analysis for this report was conducted by Public Policy Fellow Diana McCaffrey with support from Policy and Projects Director Elizabeth Newman, Associate Director Carol Sacco, and Director Emily Murase, PhD, at the San Francisco Department on the Status of Women.

The San Francisco Department on the Status of Women would like to thank the various policy body members, Commission secretaries, and department staff who graciously assisted in collecting demographic data and providing information about their respective policy bodies.

San Francisco Commission on the Status of Women

President Debbie Mesloh

Vice President Breanna Zwart

Commissioner Shokooh Miry

Commissioner Carrie Schwab-Pomerantz

Commissioner Andrea Shorter

Commissioner Julie D. Soo

Emily M. Murase, PhD, Director
Department on the Status of Women

This report is available at the San Francisco Department on the Status of Women website, <https://sfgov.org/dosw/gender-analysis-reports>.

Contents

Table of Figures	3
Executive Summary.....	4
I. Introduction	7
II. Gender Analysis Findings	8
A. Gender	8
B. Race and Ethnicity.....	11
C. Race and Ethnicity by Gender	14
D. LGBTQ Identity.....	16
E. Disability Status.....	16
F. Veteran Status.....	17
G. Policy Bodies by Budget.....	18
H. Comparison of Advisory Body and Commission and Board Demographics	19
I. Demographics of Mayoral, Supervisorial, and Total Appointees	20
III. Conclusion.....	21
IV. Methodology and Limitations.....	23
Appendix	24

Table of Figures

Figure 1: Summary Data of Policy Body Demographics, 2019.....	8
Figure 2: 10-Year Comparison of Representation of Women on Policy Bodies	8
Figure 3: Commissions and Boards with Highest Percentages of Women, 2019 Compared to 2017, 2015..	9
.....	9
Figure 4: Commissions and Boards with Lowest Percentage of Women, 2019 Compared to 2017, 2015..	10
.....	10
Figure 5: Advisory Bodies with the Highest and Lowest Percentage of Women, 2019.....	10
Figure 6: 10-Year Comparison of People of Color’s Representation of Policy Bodies.....	11
Figure 7: Race and Ethnicity of Appointees Compared to San Francisco Population, 2019.....	12
Figure 8: Commissions and Boards with Highest Percentage of People of Color, 2019 Compared to 2017, 2015	12
Figure 9: Commissions and Boards with Lowest Percentage of People of Color, 2019 Compared to 2017, 2015	13
Figure 10: Advisory Bodies with the Highest and Lowest Percentage of People of Color, 2019.....	14
Figure 11: 10-Year Comparison of Representation of Women of Color on Policy Bodies.....	14
Figure 12: Appointees by Race/Ethnicity and Gender, 2019	15
Figure 13: San Francisco Population by Race/Ethnicity, 2019	15
Figure 14: LGBTQ Identity of Appointees, 2019	16
Figure 15: LGBTQ Population of Appointees, 2019	16
Figure 16: San Francisco Adult Population with a Disability by Gender, 2017	17
Figure 17: Appointees with One or More Disabilities by Gender, 2019	17
Figure 18: San Francisco Adult Population with Military Service by Gender, 2017.....	17
Figure 19: Appointees with Military Service, 2019.....	17
Figure 20: Percent of Women, Women of Color, and People of Color on Commissions and Boards with Largest and Smallest Budgets in Fiscal Year 2018-2019	18
Figure 21: Demographics of Commissions and Boards with Largest Budgets, 2019	19
Figure 22: Demographics of Commissions and Boards with Smallest Budgets, 2019	19
Figure 23: Demographics of Appointees on Commission and Boards and Advisory Bodies, 2019	20
Figure 24: Demographics of Mayoral, Supervisorial, and Total Appointees, 2019	20
Figure 25: Policy Body Demographics, 2019.....	24
Figure 26: San Francisco Population Estimates by Race/Ethnicity, 2017	26
Figure 27: San Francisco Population Estimates by Race/Ethnicity and Gender, 2017	26

Executive Summary

In 2008, San Francisco voters overwhelmingly approved a City Charter Amendment (section 4.101) establishing as City policy for the membership of Commissions and Boards to reflect the diversity of San Francisco’s population, and that appointing officials be urged to support the nomination, appointment, and confirmation of these candidates. Additionally, it requires the San Francisco Department on the Status of Women to conduct and publish a gender analysis of Commissions and Boards every two years.

The *2019 Gender Analysis of Commissions and Boards* includes more policy bodies such as task forces, committees, and advisory bodies, than previous analyses, which were limited to Commissions and Boards. Data was collected from 84 policy bodies and from a total of 741 members mostly appointed by the Mayor and Board of Supervisors. These policy bodies fall under two categories designated by the San Francisco Office of the City Attorney.¹ The first category, referred to as “Commissions and Boards,” are policy bodies with decision-making authority and whose members are required to submit financial disclosures to the Ethics Commission. The second category, referred to as “Advisory Bodies,” are policy bodies with advisory function whose members do *not* submit financial disclosures to the Ethics Commission. This report examines policy bodies and appointees both comprehensively as a whole and separately by the two categories.


The *2019 Gender Analysis* evaluates the representation of women; people of color; lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and questioning (LGBTQ) individuals; people with disabilities; and veterans on San Francisco policy bodies.

Key Findings

Gender

- Women’s representation on policy bodies is 51%, slightly above parity with the San Francisco female population of 49%.
- Since 2009, there has been a small but steady increase in the representation of women on San Francisco policy bodies.

10-Year Comparison of Representation of Women on Policy Bodies




Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

¹ “List of City Boards, Commissions, and Advisory Bodies Created by Charter, Ordinance, or Statute,” Office of the City Attorney, <https://www.sfcityattorney.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Commission-List-08252017.pdf>, (August 25, 2017).

Race and Ethnicity

- People of color are underrepresented on policy bodies compared to the population. Although people of color comprise 62% of San Francisco’s population, just 50% of appointees identify as a race other than white.
- While the overall representation of people of color has increased between 2009 and 2019, as the Department collected data on more appointees, the representation of people of color has decreased over the last few years. The percentage of appointees of color decreased from 53% in 2017 to 49% in 2019.
- As found in previous reports, Latinx and Asian groups are underrepresented on San Francisco policy bodies compared to the population. Latinx individuals are 14% of the population but make up only 8% of appointees. Asian individuals are 31% of the population but make up only 18% of appointees.

10-Year Comparison of Representation of People of Color on Policy Bodies




Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

Race and Ethnicity by Gender

- On the whole, women of color are 32% of the San Francisco population, and 28% of appointees. Although still below parity, 28% is a slight increase compared to 2017, which showed 27% women of color appointees.
- Meanwhile, men of color are underrepresented at 21% of appointees compared to 31% of the San Francisco population.
- Both White women and men are overrepresented on San Francisco policy bodies. White women are 23% of appointees compared to 17% of the San Francisco population. White men are 26% of appointees compared to 20% of the population.
- Black and African American women and men are well-represented on San Francisco policy bodies. Black women are 9% of appointees compared to 2.4% of the population, and Black men are 5% of appointees compared to 2.5% of the population.
- Latinx women are 7% of the San Francisco population but 3% of appointees, and Latinx men are 7% of the population but 5% of appointees.
- Asian women are 17% of the San Francisco population but 11% of appointees, and Asian men are 15% of the population but just 7% of appointees.

10-Year Comparison of Representation of Women of Color on Policy Bodies



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

Additional Demographics

- Out of the 74% of appointees who responded to the survey question on LGBTQ identity, 19% identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, nonbinary, queer, or questioning, and 81% of appointees identify as straight/heterosexual.
- Out of the 70% of appointees who responded to the question on disability, 11% identify as having one or more disabilities, which is just below the 12% of the adult population with a disability in San Francisco.
- Out of the 67% of appointees who responded to the question on veteran status, 7% have served in the military compared to 3% of the San Francisco population.

Proxies for Influence: Budget & Authority

- Although women are half of all appointees, those Commissions and Boards with the largest budgets have fewer women and especially fewer women of color. Meanwhile, women exceed representation on Boards and Commissions with the smallest budgets and women of color reach parity with the population on the smallest budgeted Commissions and Boards.
- Although still underrepresented relative to the San Francisco population, there is a larger percentage of people of color on Commissions and Boards with both the largest and smallest budgets compared to overall appointees.
- The percentage of total women is greater on Advisory Bodies than Commissions and Boards. Women are 54% of appointees on Advisory Bodies and 48% of appointees on Commissions and Boards. However, the percentages of people of color and women of color on Commissions and Boards exceed the percentages of people of color and women of color on Advisory Bodies.

Appointing Authorities

- Mayoral appointments include 55% women, 52% people of color, and 30% women of color, which is more diverse by gender and race compared to both Supervisorial appointments and total appointments.

Demographics of Appointees Compared to the San Francisco Population

	Women	People of Color	Women of Color	LGBTQ	Disability Status	Veteran Status
San Francisco Population	49%	62%	32%	6%-15%*	12%	3%
Total Appointees	51%	50%	28%	19%	11%	7%
10 Largest Budgeted Commissions & Boards	41%	55%	23%			
10 Smallest Budgeted Commissions & Boards	52%	54%	32%			
Commissions and Boards	48%	52%	30%			
Advisory Bodies	54%	49%	28%			

Sources: 2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis, 2019, *Note: Estimates vary by source. See page 16 for a detailed breakdown.

I. Introduction

Inspired by the 4th UN World Conference on Women in Beijing, San Francisco became the first city in the world to adopt a local ordinance reflecting the principles of the U.N. Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination (CEDAW), an international bill of rights for women. The CEDAW Ordinance was passed unanimously by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and signed into law by Mayor Willie L. Brown, Jr. on April 13, 1998.² In 2002, the CEDAW Ordinance was revised to address the intersection of race and gender and incorporate reference to the UN Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Race Discrimination. The Ordinance requires City Government to take proactive steps to ensure gender equity and specifies “gender analysis” as a preventive tool to identify and address discrimination. Since 1998, the Department on the Status of Women has employed this tool to analyze the operations of 10 City Departments using a gender lens.

In 2007, the Department on the Status of Women conducted the first gender analysis to evaluate the number of women appointed to City Commissions and Boards. The findings of this analysis informed a City Charter Amendment developed by the Board of Supervisors for the June 2008 Election. This City Charter Amendment (Section 4.101) was overwhelmingly approved by voters and made it city policy that:

- The membership of Commissions and Boards are to reflect the diversity of San Francisco’s population,
- Appointing officials are to be urged to support the nomination, appointment, and confirmation of these candidates, and
- The Department on the Status of Women is required to conduct and publish a gender analysis of Commissions and Boards every 2 years.

The *2019 Gender Analysis* examines the representation of women; people of color; lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and questioning (LGBTQ) individuals; people with disabilities; and veterans on San Francisco policy bodies primarily appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. This year’s analysis included more outreach to policy bodies as compared to previous analyses that were limited to Commissions and Boards. As a result, more appointees were included in the data collection and analysis than even before. These policy bodies fall under two categories designated by the San Francisco Office of the City Attorney. The first category, referred to as “Commissions and Boards,” are policy bodies with decision-making authority and whose members are required to submit financial disclosures to the Ethics Commission, and the second category, referred to as “Advisory Bodies,” are policy bodies with advisory function whose members do not submit financial disclosures to the Ethics Commission. A detailed description of methodology and limitations can be found at the end of this report on page 23.

² San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 33.A.
[http://library.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/administrative/chapter33alocalimplementationoftheunited?f=templates\\$fn=default.htm\\$3.0\\$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca\\$anc=JD_Chapter33A](http://library.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/administrative/chapter33alocalimplementationoftheunited?f=templates$fn=default.htm$3.0$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca$anc=JD_Chapter33A).

II. Gender Analysis Findings

Many aspects of San Francisco’s diversity are reflected in the overall population of appointees on San Francisco policy bodies. The analysis includes 84 policy bodies, of which 823 of the 887 seats are filled leaving 7% vacant. As outlined below in the summary chart, slightly more than half of appointees are women, half of appointees are people of color, 28% are women of color, 19% are LGBTQ, 11% have a disability, and 7% are veterans.

Figure 1: Summary Data of Policy Body Demographics, 2019

Appointee Demographics	Percentage of Appointees
Women (n=741)	51%
People of Color (n=706)	50%
Women of Color (n=706)	28%
LGBTQ Identified (n=548)	19%
People with Disabilities (n=516)	11%
Veteran Status (n=494)	7%


Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

However, further analysis reveals underrepresentation of particular groups. Subsequent sections present comprehensive data analysis providing comparison to previous years, detailing the variables of gender, race/ethnicity, LGBTQ identity, disability, veteran status, and policy body characteristics of budget size, decision-making authority, and appointment authority.

A. Gender

On San Francisco policy bodies, 51% of appointees identify as women, which is slightly above parity compared to the San Francisco female population of 49%. The representation of women remained stable at 49% from 2013 until 2017. This year, the representation of women increased by 2 percentage points, which could be partly due to the larger sample size used in this year’s analysis compared to previous years. A 10-year comparison shows that the representation of women appointees has gradually increased since 2009 by a total of six percentage points.


Figure 2: 10-Year Comparison of Representation of Women on Policy Bodies



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

Figures 3 and 4 analyze Commissions and Boards. Figure 3 showcases the five Commissions and Boards with the highest representation of women appointees as compared to 2015 and 2013. The Children and Families (First Five) Commission and the Commission on the Status of Women are currently comprised of all women appointees. This finding has been consistent for the Commission on the Status of Women in 2015 and 2017. While the Ethics Commission has 100% women appointees, much more than 2015 and 2017, its small size of five appointees means that minimal changes in its demographic composition greatly impacts percentages. This is also the case for other policy bodies with a small number of members. The Library Commission and the Commission on the Environment are fourth and fifth on the list at 71% and 67% women, respectively, with long standing female majorities on each.


Figure 3: Commissions and Boards with Highest Percentages of Women, 2019 Compared to 2017, 2015



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

Out of the Commissions and Boards in this section, 23 have 40% or less women. The five Commissions and Boards with the lowest representation of women are displayed in Figure 4. The lowest percentage is found on the Board of Examiners where currently *none* of the 13 appointees are women. Unfortunately, demographic data is unavailable for the Board of Examiners for 2017 and 2015. Next is the Building Inspection Commission at 14%, which is a decrease of female representation compared to 2017 and 2015. The Oversight Board of Community Investment and Infrastructure, Fire Commission, and Sunshine Ordinance Task Force also have some of the lowest percentages of women at 17%, 20%, and 27%, respectively. Unfortunately, the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force did not participate in previous analyses and therefore demographics data is unavailable for 2017 and 2015.


Figure 4: Commissions and Boards with Lowest Percentage of Women, 2019 Compared to 2017, 2015



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

In addition to Commissions and Boards, Advisory Bodies were examined for the highest and lowest percentages of women. This is the first year such bodies have been included, thus comparison to previous years is unavailable. Figure 9 below displays the five Advisory Bodies with the highest and the five with the lowest representations of women. The Workforce Community Advisory Committees has the greatest representation of women at 100%, followed by the Office of Early Care and Education Citizen’s Advisory Committee at 89%. The Advisory Bodies with the lowest percentage of women are the Urban Forestry Council at 8% of the 13-member body and the Abatement Appeals Board at 14% of the 7-member body.

Figure 5: Advisory Bodies with the Highest and Lowest Percentage of Women, 2019




Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

B. Race and Ethnicity

Data on racial and ethnic identity was collected for 706, or 95%, of the 741 surveyed appointees. Although half of appointees identify as a race or ethnicity other than white or Caucasian, people of color are still underrepresented compared to the San Francisco population of 62%. The representation of people of color has increased since 2009 but has decreased following 2015. The number of appointees analyzed increased substantially in 2017 and 2019 compared to 2015, and these larger data samples have coincided with smaller percentages of people of color. The percentage decrease following 2017 could be partially due to the inclusion of more policy and advisory bodies, as the representation of people of color on Commissions and Boards dropped only slightly from 53% in 2017 to 52% in 2019.

Figure 6: 10-Year Comparison of Representation of People of Color on Policy Bodies



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

The racial and ethnic breakdown of policy body members compared to the San Francisco population is shown in Figure 7. This analysis reveals underrepresentation and overrepresentation in San Francisco policy bodies for certain racial and ethnic groups. Half of all appointees are white, an overrepresentation by more than 10 percentage points. The Black and African American community is well represented on appointed policy bodies at 14% compared to 5% of the population of San Francisco. Characterizing this as an overrepresentation is inaccurate given the representation of Black or African American people on policy bodies has been consistent over the years while the San Francisco population has declined over the same period.³ Furthermore, the most recent nationwide estimate for the Black or African American population is 13%, which is nearly equal to the 14% of Black or African American appointees present on San Francisco policy bodies.⁴


Considerably underrepresented racial and ethnic groups on San Francisco policy bodies compared to the San Francisco population are individuals who identify as Asian or Latinx. While Asians are 31% of the San Francisco population, they only make up 18% of appointees. While the Latinx population of San Francisco is 14%, only 8% of appointees are Latinx. Although there is a small population of Native

³ Samir Gambhir and Stephen Menendian, "Racial Segregation in the Bay Area, Part 2," *Haas Institute for a Fair and Inclusive Society* (2018).

⁴ US Census Bureau, 2018, Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US/PST045218>.

Americans and Alaska Natives in San Francisco of 0.4%, none of the surveyed appointees identified themselves as such.


Figure 7: Race and Ethnicity of Appointees Compared to San Francisco Population, 2019



Sources: 2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

The next two graphs illustrate Commissions and Boards, and Advisory Bodies with the highest and lowest percentages of people of color. As shown in Figure 8, the Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure remained at 100% from 2017, while the Juvenile Probation Commission has returned to 100% this year after a dip in 2017. Next is the Health Commission, Immigrant Rights Commission, and Housing Authority Commission at 86%, 85%, and 83%, respectively. Percentages of people of color on both the Health Commission and the Housing Authority Commission increased following 2015, and have remained consistent since 2017.


Figure 8: Commissions and Boards with Highest Percentage of People of Color, 2019 Compared to 2017, 2015



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

There are 23 policy bodies that have 40% or less appointees who identified a racial and ethnic category other than white. Although the Public Utilities Commission has two vacancies, *none* of the current appointees identify as people of color. The Historic Preservation Commission and Building Inspection Commission are both at 14% representation for people of color. The Building Inspection Commission had a large drop from 43% in 2015, with the percentage of people of color decreasing to 14% in 2017 and remaining at this percent for 2019. Lastly, the War Memorial Board of Trustees and City Hall Preservation Advisory Commission have 18% and 20%, respectively.


Figure 9: Commissions and Boards with Lowest Percentage of People of Color, 2019 Compared to 2017, 2015



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

In addition to Commissions and Boards, Advisory Bodies were examined for the highest and lowest percentages of people of color. This is the first year such bodies have been included, thus comparison to previous years is unavailable. All members of the Workforce Community Advisory Committee are people of color. People of color comprise 80% of the Sugary Drinks Distributor Tax Advisory Committee, and 75% of appointees on the Children, Youth and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee, the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority, and the Local Homeless Coordinating Board. Out of the five Advisory Bodies with the lowest representation of people of color, the Ballot Simplification Committee and the Mayor’s Disability Council have 25% appointees of color, and the Abatement Appeals Board has 14% appointees of color. The Urban Forestry and the Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee have no people of color currently serving.

Figure 10: Advisory Bodies with the Highest and Lowest Percentage of People of Color, 2019




Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

C. Race and Ethnicity by Gender

White men and women are overrepresented on San Francisco policy bodies, while Asian and Latinx men and women are underrepresented. While women of color continue to be underrepresented at 28% compared to the San Francisco population of 32%, this is a slight increase from 2017 which showed 27% women of color. Meanwhile, men of color are 21% of appointees compared to 31% of the San Francisco population.


Figure 11: 10-Year Comparison of Representation of Women of Color on Policy Bodies



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.


The following figures present the breakdown for appointees and the San Francisco population by race and ethnicity and gender. White men and women are overrepresented, holding 27% and 23% of appointments, respectively, compared to 20% and 17% of the population, respectively. Asian men and women are both greatly underrepresented with Asian women making up 11% of appointees compared to 17% of the population while Asian men comprise 7% of appointees and 15% of the population. Latinx men and women are also underrepresented, particularly Latinx women, who are 3% of appointees and 7% of the population, while Latinx men are 5% of appointees and 7% of the population. Black or African American men and women are well-represented with Black women comprising 9% of appointees and Black men comprising 5% of appointees. Pacific Islander men and women, and multiethnic women also exceed parity with the population. Although Native American men and women make up only 0.4% of San Francisco’s population, none of the surveyed appointees identified themselves as such.

Figure 12: Appointees by Race/Ethnicity and Gender, 2019



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

Figure 13: San Francisco Population by Race/Ethnicity, 2019



Source: 2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.


D. LGBTQ Identity

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and questioning (LGBTQ) identity data was collected from 548, or 75%, of the 741 surveyed appointees, which is much more data on LGBTQ identity compared to previous reports. Due to limited and outdated information on the population of the LGBTQ community in San Francisco, it is difficult to adequately assess the representation of the LGBTQ community. However, compared to available San Francisco, larger Bay Area, and national data, the LGBTQ community is well represented on San Francisco policy bodies. Recent research estimates the national LGBT population is 4.5%.⁵ The LGBT population of the San Francisco and greater Bay Area is estimated to rank the highest of U.S. cities at 6.2%,⁶ while a 2006 survey found that 15.4% of adults in San Francisco identify as LGBT⁷.

Of the appointees who responded to this question, 19% identify as LGBTQ and 81% identify as straight or heterosexual. Of the LGBTQ appointees, 48% identify as gay, 23% as lesbian, 17% as bisexual, 7% as queer, 5% as transgender, and 1% as questioning. Data on LGBTQ identity by race was not captured. Efforts to capture data on LGBTQ identity by race for future reports would enable more intersectional analysis.

Figure 14: LGBTQ Identity of Appointees, 2019


(N=548)



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

Figure 15: LGBTQ Population of Appointees, 2019

(N=104)



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

E. Disability Status

Overall, 12% of adults in San Francisco have one or more disabilities, and when broken down by gender, 6.2% are women and 5.7% are men. Disability data for transgender and gender non-conforming individuals in San Francisco is currently unavailable. Data on disability was obtained from 516, or 70%, of the 741 appointees who participated in the survey. Of the 516 appointees, 11.2% reported to have one

⁵ Frank Newport, "In U.S., Estimate of LGBT Population Rises to 4.5%," *GALLUP* (May 22, 2018) <https://news.gallup.com/poll/234863/estimate-lgbt-population-rises.aspx>.


⁶ Gary J. Gates and Frank Newport, "San Francisco Metro Area Ranks Highest in LBGT Percentage," *GALLUP* (March 20, 2015) https://news.gallup.com/poll/182051/san-francisco-metro-area-ranks-highest-lgbt-percentage.aspx?utm_source=Social%20Issues&utm_medium=newsfeed&utm_campaign=tiles.

⁷ Gary J. Gates, "Same Sex Couples and the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual Population: New Estimates from the American Community Survey," *The Williams Institute on Sexual Orientation Law and Public Policy, UCLA School of Law* (2006).

or more disabilities, which is near parity with the San Francisco population. Of the 11.2% appointees with one or more disabilities, 6.8% are women, 3.9% are men, 0.4% are trans women, and 0.2% are trans men.

Figure 16: San Francisco Adult Population with a Disability by Gender, 2017


(N=744,243)



Source: 2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

Figure 17: Appointees with One or More Disabilities by Gender, 2019

(N=516)




Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

F. Veteran Status

Overall, 3.2% of the adult population in San Francisco has served in the military. There is a considerable difference by gender, as male veterans are 3% and female veterans are 0.2% of the population. Data on veteran status was obtained from 494, or 67%, of appointees who participated in the survey. Of the 494 appointees who responded to this question, 7.1% have served in the military. Like the San Francisco population, there is a large difference by gender, as men comprise 5.7% and women make up only 1.2% of the total number of veteran appointees. Of participating appointees, 0.2% of veterans are trans women. Veteran status data on transgender and gender non-conforming individuals in San Francisco is currently unavailable.

Figure 18: San Francisco Adult Population with Military Service by Gender, 2017


(N=747,896)



Source: 2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

Figure 19: Appointees with Military Service, 2019

(N=494)




Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

G. Policy Bodies by Budget

This report also examines whether policy bodies with the largest and smallest budget sizes and other characteristics are demographically representative of the San Francisco population. In this section, budget size is used as a proxy for influence. Although this report has expanded the scope of analysis to include more policy bodies compared to previous reports, this section of analysis was limited to Commissions and Boards with decision-making authority and whose members file financial disclosures with the Ethics Commission. The purpose of this analysis is to evaluate the demographics for the spectrum of budgetary influence of policy bodies with decision-making authority in San Francisco.

Overall, appointees from the 10 largest budgeted Commissions and Boards are 55% people of color, 41% women, and 23% women of color. Appointees from the 10 smallest budgeted Commissions and Boards are 54% people of color, 52% women, and 32% women of color. Although still below parity with the San Francisco population, the representation of people of color on both the largest and smallest budgeted policy bodies is greater than the percentage of people of color for all appointees combined (50%). For women and women of color, their representation meets or exceeds parity with the population on the 10 smallest budgeted bodies. However, it falls far below parity for the 10 largest budgeted bodies. The representation of total women and women of color is greater on smaller budgeted policy bodies by 27%, and 39%, respectively.

Figure 20: Percent of Women, Women of Color, and People of Color on Commissions and Boards with Largest and Smallest Budgets in Fiscal Year 2018-2019



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

Figure 21: Demographics of Commissions and Boards with Largest Budgets, 2019

Body	FY18-19 Budget	Total Seats	Filled seats	Women	Women of Color	People of Color
Health Commission	\$2,200,000,000	7	7	29%	14%	86%
Public Utilities Commission	\$1,296,600,000	5	3	67%	0%	0%
MTA Board of Directors and Parking Authority Commission	\$1,200,000,000	7	7	57%	14%	43%
Airport Commission	\$1,000,000,000	5	5	40%	20%	40%
Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure	\$745,000,000	5	5	60%	60%	100%
Police Commission	\$687,139,793	7	7	43%	43%	71%
Health Authority (Plan Governing Board)	\$666,000,000	19	15	33%	27%	47%
Human Services Commission	\$529,900,000	5	5	40%	0%	40%
Fire Commission	\$400,721,970	5	5	20%	20%	40%
Aging and Adult Services Commission	\$334,700,000	7	7	43%	14%	57%
Total	\$9,060,061,763	72	66	41%	23%	55%

Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

Figure 22: Demographics of Commissions and Boards with Smallest Budgets, 2019


Body	FY18-19 Budget	Total Seats	Filled Seats	Women	Women of color	People of Color
Rent Board Commission	\$8,543,912	10	9	44%	11%	33%
Commission on the Status of Women	\$8,048,712	7	7	100%	71%	71%
Ethics Commission	\$6,458,045	5	4	100%	50%	50%
Human Rights Commission	\$4,299,600	12	10	50%	50%	70%
Small Business Commission	\$2,242,007	7	7	43%	29%	43%
Civil Service Commission	\$1,262,072	5	4	50%	0%	25%
Board of Appeals	\$1,072,300	5	5	40%	20%	40%
Entertainment Commission	\$1,003,898	7	7	29%	14%	57%
Assessment Appeals Board No.1, 2, & 3	\$663,423	24	18	39%	22%	44%
Youth Commission	\$305,711	17	16	56%	44%	75%
Total	\$33,899,680	99	87	52%	32%	54%

Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

H. Comparison of Advisory Body and Commission and Board Demographics

The comparison of the two policy body categories in this section provides another proxy for influence, as Commissions and Boards whose members file disclosures of economic interest have greater decision-making authority in San Francisco than Advisory Bodies whose members do not file economic interest disclosures. The percentages of total women, LGBTQ people, people with disabilities, and veterans are larger for total appointees on Advisory Bodies. However, the percentages of women of color and people of color on Commissions and Boards slightly exceeds the percentages of women of color and people of color on Advisory Bodies.

Figure 23: Demographics of Appointees on Commission and Boards and Advisory Bodies, 2019




Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

I. Demographics of Mayoral, Supervisorial, and Total Appointees

Figure 24 compares the representation of women, women of color, and people of color for appointments made by the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and by the total of all approving authorities combined. Mayoral appointments are more diverse, and consist of more women, women of color, and people of color compared to Supervisorial appointments. Mayoral appointments include 55% women, 30% women of color, and 52% people of color, while Supervisorial appointments are 48% women, 24% women of color, and 48% people of color. The total of all approving authorities combined average out at 51% women, 28% women of color, and 50% people of color. This disparity in diversity between Mayoral and Supervisorial appointments may be due in part to the appointment section process for each authority. The 11-member Board of Supervisors only sees applicants for specific bodies through the 3-member Rules Committee or by designees, stipulated in legislation (e.g. “renter,” “landlord,” “consumer advocate”), whereas the Mayor typically has the ability to take total appointments into account during selections, and can therefore better address gaps in diversity.

Figure 24: Demographics of Mayoral, Supervisorial, and Total Appointees, 2019



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

III. Conclusion

Since the first gender analysis of Commissions and Boards in 2007, the representation of women appointees on San Francisco policy bodies has gradually increased. The *2019 Gender Analysis* finds the percentage of women appointees is 51%, which slightly exceeds the population of women in San Francisco.

When appointee demographics are analyzed by gender and race, women of color continue to be underrepresented on San Francisco policy bodies compared to the San Francisco population. Most notably underrepresented are Asian women who make up 17% of the population but only 11% of appointees, and Latinx women who make up 7% of the population but only 3% of appointees. Additionally, men of color are underrepresented relative to their San Francisco population, primarily Asian and Latinx men.

Furthermore, when analyzing the demographic composition of larger and smaller budgeted Commissions and Boards, women are underrepresented on those with the largest budgets, and overrepresented or reach parity with the population on smaller budgeted Commissions and Boards. These two trends are amplified for women of color appointees. Women comprise 41% of total appointees on the largest budgeted policy bodies, which is 8 percentage points below the population, and women of color comprise 23% of total appointees on the largest budgeted policy bodies, 9 percentage points below their San Francisco population. Comparatively, women are 52% of total appointees on the smallest budgeted policy bodies, and women of color are 32% of appointees, which is equal to the San Francisco population. However, the issue of largest and smallest budgeted policy bodies does not seem to impact the representation of people of color. People of color make up 55% of appointees on the largest budgeted policy bodies and 54% of appointees on the smallest budgeted policy bodies compared to 50% of total appointees. Nonetheless, these percentages still fall below the San Francisco population of people of color at 62%.

In addition to using budget size as a proxy for influence, this report analyzed demographic characteristics of appointees on Commissions and Boards who file disclosures of economic interest and have decision-making authority, and appointees on Advisory Bodies who do not file economic interest disclosures. Over half (54%) of appointees on Advisory Bodies are women, while 48% of appointees on Commissions and Boards are women. Although 48% is only slightly below the San Francisco population of women, women comprise a decently higher percentage of appointees on Advisory Bodies compared to Commissions and Boards.

This year's report features more data on LGBTQ identity, veteran status, and disability than previous gender analyses. The *2019 Gender Analysis* found a relatively high representation of LGBTQ individuals on San Francisco policy bodies. For the appointees that provided LGBTQ identity information, 19% identify as LGBTQ with the largest subset being gay men at 48%. It is recommended for future gender analyses to collect LGBTQ data by race and gender to provide additional intersectional analysis. The representation of appointees with disabilities is 11%, just below the 12% population. Veterans are highly represented on San Francisco policy bodies at 7% compared to the veteran population of 3%.

Additionally, this report evaluates and compares the representation of women, women of color, and people of color appointees by the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and by the total of all approving authorities combined. Mayoral appointees include 55% women, 30% women of color, and 52% people

of color, which overall is more diverse by gender and race compared to both Supervisorial appointees and total appointees.

This report is intended to advise the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and other appointing authorities, as they select appointments for policy bodies of the City and County of San Francisco. In spirit of the 2008 City Charter Amendment that establishes this biennial Gender Analysis report requirement and the importance of diversity on San Francisco policy bodies, efforts to address gaps in diversity and inclusion should remain at the forefront when making appointments in order to accurately reflect the population of San Francisco.

IV. Methodology and Limitations

This report focuses on City and County of San Francisco Commissions, Boards, Task Forces, Councils, and Committees that have the majority of members appointed by the Mayor and Board of Supervisors and that have jurisdiction limited to the City. The gender analysis reflects data from the policy bodies that provided information to the Department on the Status of Women through digital and paper survey.

Data was requested from 90 policy bodies and acquired from 84 different policy bodies and a total of 741 appointees. A Commissioner or Board member's gender identity, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, disability status, and veteran status were among data elements collected on a voluntary basis. Data on lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, or questioning (LGBTQ) identity, disability, and veteran status of appointees were incomplete or unavailable for some appointees but are included to the extent possible. As the fundamental objective of this report is to surface patterns of underrepresentation, every attempt has been made to reflect accurate and complete information in this report. Data for some policy bodies was incomplete, and all appointees who responded were included in the total demographic categories. Only policy bodies with full data on gender and race for all appointees were included in sections comparing demographics of individual bodies. It should be noted that for policy bodies with a small number of members, the change of a single individual greatly impacts the percentages of demographic categories. As such, these percentages should be interpreted with this in mind.

The surveyed policy bodies fall under two categories designated by the San Francisco Office of the City Attorney document entitled *List of City Boards, Commissions, and Advisory Bodies Created by Charter, Ordinance, or Statute*.⁸ This document separates San Francisco policy bodies into two different categories. The first category includes Commissions and Boards with decision-making authority and whose members are required to submit financial disclosures with the Ethics Commission, and the second category encompasses Advisory Bodies whose members do not submit financial disclosures with the Ethics Commission. Depending on the analysis criteria in each section of this report, the surveyed policy bodies and appointees are either examined comprehensively as a whole or examined separately in the two categories designated by the Office of the City Attorney.

Data from the U.S. Census 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates provides a comparison to the San Francisco population. Figures 26 and 27 in the Appendix display these population estimates by race/ethnicity and gender.

⁸ "List of City Boards, Commissions, and Advisory Bodies Created by Charter, Ordinance, or Statute," Office of the City Attorney, <https://www.sfcityattorney.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Commission-List-08252017.pdf>, (August 25, 2017).

Appendix

Figure 25: Policy Body Demographics, 2019⁹

Policy Body	Total Seats	Filled Seats	FY18-19 Budget	Women	Women of Color	People of Color
Abatement Appeals Board	7	7	\$76,500,000	14%	0%	14%
Aging and Adult Services Commission	7	7	\$334,700,000	57%	33%	57%
Airport Commission	5	5	\$1,000,000,000	40%	50%	40%
Arts Commission	15	15	\$37,000,000	67%	50%	60%
Asian Art Commission	27	27	\$30,000,000	63%	71%	59%
Assessment Appeals Board No.1	8	5	\$663,423	20%	0%	20%
Assessment Appeals Board No.2	8	8	-	50%	75%	63%
Assessment Appeals Board No.3	8	4	-	50%	50%	50%
Ballot Simplification Committee	5	4	\$0	75%	33%	25%
Bayview Hunters Point Citizens Advisory Committee	12	9	\$0	33%	100%	67%
Board of Appeals	5	5	\$1,072,300	40%	50%	40%
Board of Examiners	13	13	\$0	0%	0%	46%
Building Inspection Commission	7	7	\$76,500,000	14%	0%	14%
Child Care Planning and Advisory Council	25	19	\$26,841	84%	50%	50%
Children and Families Commission (First 5)	9	8	\$28,002,978	100%	75%	75%
Children, Youth, and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee	11	10	\$155,224,346	50%	80%	75%
Citizen's Committee on Community Development	9	8	\$39,696,467	75%	67%	63%
City Hall Preservation Advisory Commission	5	5	\$0	60%	33%	20%
Civil Service Commission	5	4	\$1,262,072	50%	0%	25%
Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure	5	5	\$745,000,000	60%	100%	100%
Commission on the Aging Advisory Council	22	15	\$0	80%	33%	31%
Commission on the Environment	7	6	\$27,280,925	67%	50%	50%
Commission on the Status of Women	7	7	\$8,048,712	100%	71%	71%
Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Committee	11	11	\$3,000,000	82%	33%	45%
Eastern Neighborhoods Citizens Advisory Committee	19	13	\$0	38%	40%	44%
Elections Commission	7	7	\$15,238,360	57%	25%	29%
Entertainment Commission	7	7	\$1,003,898	29%	50%	57%
Ethics Commission	5	4	\$6,458,045	100%	50%	50%
Film Commission	11	11	\$0	55%	67%	50%
Fire Commission	5	5	\$400,721,970	20%	100%	40%
Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority	7	6	\$0	50%	67%	75%

⁹ Figure 25 only includes policy bodies with complete data on gender for all appointees. Some bodies had incomplete data on race/ethnicity of appointees. For these, percentages for people of color are calculated out of known race/ethnicity.

Policy Body	Total Seats	Filled Seats	FY18-19 Budget	Women	Women of Color	People of Color
Health Authority (Plan Governing Board)	19	15	\$666,000,000	33%	80%	50%
Health Commission	7	7	\$2,200,000,000	43%	50%	86%
Health Service Board	7	6	\$11,632,022	33%	0%	50%
Historic Preservation Commission	7	7	\$53,832,000	43%	33%	14%
Housing Authority Commission	7	6	\$60,894,150	50%	100%	83%
Human Rights Commission	12	10	\$4,299,600	60%	100%	70%
Human Services Commission	5	5	\$529,900,000	40%	0%	40%
Immigrant Rights Commission	15	13	\$0	54%	86%	85%
In-Home Supportive Services Public Authority	13	9	\$70,729,667	44%	50%	56%
Juvenile Probation Commission	7	6	\$48,824,199	33%	100%	100%
Library Commission	7	7	\$160,000,000	71%	40%	57%
Local Homeless Coordinating Board	9	9	\$40,000,000	56%	60%	75%
Mayor's Disability Council	11	8	\$0	75%	17%	25%
Mental Health Board	17	15	\$184,962	73%	64%	73%
MTA Board of Directors and Parking Authority Commission	7	7	\$1,200,000,000	57%	25%	43%
Office of Early Care and Education Citizens' Advisory Committee	9	9	\$0	89%	50%	56%
Oversight Board (COII)	7	6	\$745,000,000	17%	100%	67%
Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee	17	13	\$0	46%	17%	8%
Planning Commission	7	6	\$53,832,000	50%	67%	33%
Police Commission	7	7	\$687,139,793	43%	100%	71%
Port Commission	5	5	\$192,600,000	60%	67%	60%
Public Utilities Citizen's Advisory Committee	17	13	\$0	54%	14%	31%
Public Utilities Commission	5	3	\$1,296,600,000	67%	0%	0%
Public Utilities Rate Fairness Board	7	6	\$0	33%	100%	67%
Public Utilities Revenue Bond Oversight Committee	7	5	\$0	40%	50%	40%
Recreation and Park Commission	7	7	\$230,900,000	29%	50%	43%
Reentry Council	24	23	\$0	43%	70%	70%
Rent Board Commission	10	9	\$8,543,912	44%	25%	33%
Residential Users Appeal Board	3	2	\$0	0%	0%	50%
Retirement System Board	7	7	\$95,000,000	43%	67%	29%
Sentencing Commission	13	13	\$0	31%	25%	67%
Small Business Commission	7	7	\$2,242,007	43%	67%	43%
SRO Task Force	12	12	\$0	42%	25%	55%
Sugary Drinks Distributor Tax Advisory Committee	16	15	\$0	67%	70%	80%
Sunshine Ordinance Task Force	11	11	\$0	27%	67%	36%
Sweatfree Procurement Advisory Group	11	7	\$0	43%	67%	43%
Treasure Island Development Authority	7	6	\$18,484,130	50%	N/A	N/A

Policy Body	Total Seats	Filled Seats	FY18-19 Budget	Women	Women of Color	People of Color
Treasure Island/Yerba Buena Island Citizens Advisory Board	17	13	\$0	54%	N/A	N/A
Urban Forestry Council	15	13	\$153,626	8%	0%	0%
Veterans Affairs Commission	17	11	\$0	36%	50%	55%
War Memorial Board of Trustees	11	11	\$18,185,686	55%	33%	18%
Workforce Community Advisory Committee	8	4	\$0	100%	100%	100%
Youth Commission	17	16	\$305,711	56%	78%	75%

Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis, 2019.

Figure 26: San Francisco Population Estimates by Race/Ethnicity, 2017

Race/Ethnicity	Total	
	Estimate	Percent
San Francisco County California	864,263	-
White, Not Hispanic or Latino	353,000	38%
Asian	295,347	31%
Hispanic or Latinx	131,949	14%
Some other Race	64,800	7%
Black or African American	45,654	5%
Two or More Races	43,664	5%
Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander	3,226	0.3%
Native American and Alaska Native	3,306	0.4%

Source: 2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

Figure 27: San Francisco Population Estimates by Race/Ethnicity and Gender, 2017

Race/Ethnicity	Total		Female		Male	
	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent
San Francisco County California	864,263	-	423,630	49%	440,633	51%
White, Not Hispanic or Latino	353,000	38%	161,381	17%	191,619	20%
Asian	295,347	31%	158,762	17%	136,585	15%
Hispanic or Latinx	131,949	14%	62,646	7%	69,303	7%
Some Other Race	64,800	7%	30,174	3%	34,626	4%
Black or African American	45,654	5%	22,311	2.4%	23,343	2.5%
Two or More Races	43,664	5%	21,110	2.2%	22,554	2.4%
Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander	3,226	0.3%	1,576	0.2%	1,650	0.2%
Native American and Alaska Native	3,306	0.4%	1,589	0.2%	1,717	0.2%

Source: 2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

City and County of San Francisco
Department on the Status of Women
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 240
San Francisco, California 94102
sfgov.org/dosw
dosw@sfgov.org
415.252.2570

Introduction Form

By a Member of the Board of Supervisors or Mayor

Time stamp
or meeting date

I hereby submit the following item for introduction (select only one):

- 1. For reference to Committee. (An Ordinance, Resolution, Motion or Charter Amendment).
- 2. Request for next printed agenda Without Reference to Committee.
- 3. Request for hearing on a subject matter at Committee.
- 4. Request for letter beginning : "Supervisor inquiries"
- 5. City Attorney Request.
- 6. Call File No. from Committee.
- 7. Budget Analyst request (attached written motion).
- 8. Substitute Legislation File No.
- 9. Reactivate File No.
- 10. Topic submitted for Mayoral Appearance before the BOS on

Please check the appropriate boxes. The proposed legislation should be forwarded to the following:

- Small Business Commission
- Youth Commission
- Ethics Commission
- Planning Commission
- Building Inspection Commission


Note: For the Imperative Agenda (a resolution not on the printed agenda), use the Imperative Form.

Sponsor(s):

Subject:

The text is listed:

Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor:



For Clerk's Use Only